

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/078,521		02/21/2002	Luciano Mondani	25-335	25-335 4703		
23117	7590	12/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
		RHYE, PC	FOX, CHA	FOX, CHARLES A			
1100 N GLI 8TH FLOO		D		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTO	N, VA	22201-4714		3652	3652		

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	
1	10/078,52	21	MONDANI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Charles A	. Fox	3652	A
The MAILING DATE of this communication	1			ess
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	'ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no eve tion. s, a reply within the state period will apply and wi y statute, cause the appl	ent, however, may a reply be ti utory minimum of thirty (30) da Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror lication to become ABANDON	imely filed  ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this comm  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	26 August 2004			
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)∑	This action is n	on-final.		
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for a	<del>-</del>	•		erits is
closed in accordance with the practice u	nder <i>Ex parte Qu</i>	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi		nsideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election re	equirement.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 February 2002</u>	gis/are: a)⊠ aco	cepted or b) object	ed to by the Examiner	•
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	,	=	=	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. No	ote the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-	·152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	oreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:				
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docu	uments have bee	n received.		
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority docu	uments have bee	n received in Applica	tion-No	
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of th	, ,		ed in this National Sta	age
application from the International E	•			
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certi	ned copies not receiv	red.	•
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	,	4) Interview Summar		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9		Paper No(s)/Mail [	Date Patent Application (PTO-15	52)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ Paper No(s)/Mail Date	00/ld0)	6) Other:	. atom replication (F 10-1)	~~)
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	ffice Action Summa	ry F	Part of Paper No./Mail Date	20041127

Art Unit: 3652

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abels et al. In regards to claim 1 Abels et al. 4,125,199 disclose a sideshift assembly for a forklift comprising:

a carriage comprising a pair of vertical members (101) that are horizontally spaced;

a frame support member (104) secured transversely to said vertical members; wherein said vertical members are movably secured in the mast of said forklift; a side shift frame comprising an upper cross member (105a), a lower cross member (105) and at least 2 side members (107);

said upper cross member having a lower contact surface for sliding engagement with said frame support member (104);

side shift operator means (122) for causing lateral movement of said frame, wherein said means is slidably received in a portion of said frame support member.

Regarding claim 14 Abels et al. disclose a side shift assembly for a forklift comprising:

a carriage comprising a pair of vertical members (101) that are horizontally spaced;

a frame support member (104) secured transversely to said vertical members; side shift operator means (122) for causing lateral movement of said frame, wherein said means is slidably received in a portion of said frame support member.

a side shift frame comprising an upper cross member (105a), a lower cross member (105) and at least 2 side members (107);

said upper cross member having a lower contact surface for sliding engagement with said frame support member (104);

wherein said upper member further comprises a planer front portion that protects the side shift operator means by preventing good carried by the forks to touch the front face (104a) of the support member which forms a portion of the side shift operator means.

In regards to claim 15 Abels et al. also discloses that the upper surface of the support member is convex and the lower surface of the upper cross member is concave, wherein said surfaces are slidably engaged with each other.

In regards to claims 16 and 17 Abels et al. further teach that said side shift frame is a quadrilateral shape with parallel side forming a rectangle.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 3652

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bolzoni. In regards to claims 2,4 and 7 Abels et al. teach the limitations of claim 1 as above, they also teach the device as having a fork position device, but not the particular fork positioner as in the instant application. Bolzoni DE 198 05 790 A1 teaches a fork positioner for a forklift truck, said positioner comprising:

first and second shoe members (14) adapted to slide horizontally along a sliding surface (33) of a side shift carriage;

each of said shoes adapted to receive a shank portion of a fork, said contact portion of said shoe being coplanar with a front face of a side shift frame;

said positioner adapted to move said shoes relative to each other such that the shoes are equidistant from the centerline of said side shift frame at all times. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al. with a fork positioner as taught by Bolzoni in order to allow an operator to change the spacing of the forks from the operators seat while maintaining the operators view of the forks.

In regards to claim 3 Abels et al. further teach that said side shift frame is rectangular.

Art Unit: 3652

In regards to claim 5 Abels et al. also teach that the upper surface of the support member is convex and the lower surface of the upper cross member is concave, wherein said surfaces are slidably engaged with each other. See figure 12.

In regards to claim 6 Abels et al. also teaches said upper cross member defines a planer portion overhanging a front side of said support member.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al. and Bolzoni as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of German patent 200 20 292 U1. Abels et al. and Bolzoni teach the limitations of claim 2 as above, they do not teach the side shift being driven by a pair of hydraulic cylinders. German patent '292 teaches a side shift carriage that uses two single action cylinder to move a side shift frame in one of two direction depending upon which cylinder is engaged, wherein each of the cylinders are sealed to prevent the escape of hydraulic fluid around the piston. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al. and Bolzoni with the cylinders as taught by the German '292 patent in order to simplify the hydraulic system by using single action cylinders to move the side shift frame.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of French Patent 76 02832. Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 teach the limitations of claim 8 as above, they do not teach pads between the cylinders and the frame. French patent '832 teaches placing piston pads between a hydraulic cylinder and a side shift frame member. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of

Art Unit: 3652

invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 with piston pads as taught by French patent '832 to spread the load applied to the frame over a larger area.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Sorlie. In regards to claim 11 Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 teach the limitations of claim 8 as above, Bolzoni further teaches the forks are maintained an equidistant length from the center line of the side shift carriage. They do not teach any particular type of drive system for the fork positioner. Sorlie US 5,190,436 teaches using hydraulic cylinders to position forks within a side shift frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al., Bolzoni and German '292 with the hydraulic cylinder taught by Sorlie in order to drive the fork positioner using a well known drive means as suggested by Bolzoni.

In regards to claims 12 and 13 Bolzoni further teaches that said center fork positioner is comprised of an upper chain and a lower chain forming a chain loop, wherein said chain loop is used to move said first and second shoes at the same time.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al. as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of German patent 200 20 292 U1. Abels et al. teach the limitations of claim 16 as above, they do not teach the side shift being driven by a pair of hydraulic cylinders. German patent '292 teaches a side shift carriage that uses two single action cylinder to move a

side shift frame in one of two direction depending upon which cylinder is engaged, wherein each of the cylinders are sealed to prevent the escape of hydraulic fluid around the piston. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al. with the cylinders as taught by the German '292 patent in order to simplify the hydraulic system by using single action cylinders to move the side shift frame.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abels et al. and German '292 as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of French Patent 76 02832. Abels et al. and German '292 teach the limitations of claim 18 as above, they do not teach pads between the cylinders and the frame. French patent '832 teaches placing piston pads between a hydraulic cylinder and a side shift frame member. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Abels et al. and German '292 with piston pads as taught by French patent '832 to spread the load applied to the frame over a larger area.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bostad et al. in view of Bolzoni. Bostad et al. teach a sideshift assembly for a forklift comprising:

a carriage comprising a pair of vertical members (16) that are horizontally spaced;

a frame support member (33) secured transversely to said vertical members; wherein said vertical members are movably secured in the mast of said forklift;

a side shift frame comprising an upper cross member (34), a lower cross member (28) and at least 2 side members (30,32);

said upper cross member having a lower contact surface for sliding engagement with said frame support member (33);

side shift operator means (52) for causing lateral movement of said frame, wherein said means is located in a portion of said frame support member. They do not teach the device as having a fork position device. Bolzoni teaches a fork positioner for a forklift truck, said positioner comprising:

first and second shoe members (14) adapted to slide horizontally along a sliding surface (33) of a side shift carriage;

each of said shoes adapted to receive a shank portion of a fork, said contact portion of said shoe being coplanar with a front face of a side shift frame;

said positioner adapted to move said shoes relative to each other such that the shoes are equidistant from the centerline of said side shift frame at all times. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Bostad et al. with a fork positioner as taught by Bolzoni in order to allow an operator to change the spacing of the forks from the operators seat while maintaining the operators view of the forks.

#### Response to Amendment

The amendments filed on August 26, 2004 have been entered into the record.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed August 26, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim 14 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Abels et al.

Applicant's arguments filed August 26, 2004 regarding claim 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The fork positioner in the instant application has no range of motions given. While the range of motions of the fork positioner taught by Bostad and Bolzoni would be limited to motion within members (31) of the Bostad reference this still meets the limitations of the claim. As the fork positioner taught by Bolzoni is easily combinable with the side shift carriage taught by Bostad the rejection is maintained as before. Lastly a portion of the side shift operator taught by Bostad is located within a portion of the support frame.

Any-inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 703-605-4294. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-5:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 703-308-3248. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3652

Page 10

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

**CAF** 

CAF

11-27-04

EILEEN D. LILLIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600